

DARPA-BAA-10-59  
META-II

Questions & Answers  
April 28, 2010

*Q1: Since May 31 is Memorial Day, will the initial closing due date roll forward to June 1?*

A1: The BAA has been amended with a new due date of June 4, 2010 for the initial round of proposal reviews.

*Q2: Is this new BAA or an extension of the original META BAA, i.e., are you just looking for participants in the first phases of the original BAA to bid or are you looking for additional proposal teams? How does this new BAA relate to the original BAA?*

A2: The META-II BAA is not an extension of the previous META BAA. It is an entirely new solicitation. No restrictions are levied on META-II proposers on the basis of submission, non-submission, selection, or non-selection as part of the previous META solicitation. In other words, you do not need to have proposed to META to propose to META-II. You may propose to META-II if your proposal was not selected under META. You may likewise propose to META-II if your proposal was selected under META; in this latter scenario, proposers are advised to avoid submissions that are duplicative of work already selected for funding.

The META-II BAA addresses some topics similar to the META BAA, as well as some new ones. It also employs a substantially different contracting approach that is intended to make it easier for small businesses and academics to propose innovative solutions that cover only a portion of the problem space without necessarily having the capability to offer an end-to-end solution or act as a demonstration system integrator.

*Q3: Would appreciate knowing, if there would be any issues if we include researchers (subs) from outside of US?*

A3: There are no specific DARPA restrictions on foreign proposers or subcontractors. In fact, such participation is encouraged to the extent that it can expand the space of innovative ideas and solutions brought to bear on the problems described in the BAA. The onus for compliance with applicable statutes and regulations is on the proposer. As p. 11 of the BAA states: "Foreign participants and/or individuals may participate to the extent that such participants comply with any necessary Non-Disclosure Agreements, Security Regulations, Export Control Laws, and other governing statutes applicable under the circumstances."

*Q4: We are considering the use of offshore developers (based in the UK) to develop the toolkit. Do you foresee any issues with this approach?*

A4: Please see answer A3 above. It is the proposer's responsibility to assess the statutory, regulatory, and practical implications of teaming arrangements with foreign parties. Neither DARPA nor this BAA particularly levies any additional restrictions on such participants.

*Q5: Please provide clarification relating to Intellectual Property expectations when utilizing commercial tools.*

A5: DARPA does not desire any intellectual property rights (beyond those that it might otherwise receive under the FAR and DFARS) for software that is commercially available and was not developed with META-II funding. Any modifications or additions thereto are subject to intellectual property objectives as delineated in the BAA.

Thus, for instance, if an offeror were to propose to develop META-II tools using MATLAB scripts, DARPA would not be looking to obtain any intellectual property rights to the MATLAB software itself or any libraries commercially or openly supplied therewith. DARPA would, however, desire Unlimited Rights to the MATLAB scripts that instantiate the META-II tools.

*Q6: Are the page counts listed relative to each technology proposed, or for all technology areas proposed?*

A6: The page counts apply to each proposal submitted. As the BAA states on p. 6: "Offerors may submit proposals to one, several, or all of the technical areas detailed below. Although the technical areas are clearly inter-related, offerors are encouraged to submit separate proposals for each one or include them as priced options to their core proposal so as to enable DARPA to fund a subset of their proposed technical areas."

*Q7: Do you anticipate the deliverables to include a verified /certified toolset, or a toolset which will be verified/certified outside the scope of this program? If the toolset is to be verified/certified within the scope of this program, have you made arrangements for this to be conducted using government parties, or is it the responsibility of the proposer to make appropriate arrangements?*

A7: There is no specific requirement for the level of verification or certification of any tools developed. However, the proposed approach to tool verification and quality assurance would certainly be considered in the context of the technical merit of a proposal.

*Q8: Are you allowing one-on-one conversations with the DARPA PM to take place? If so, could we please schedule time to speak?*

A8: In the interest of maintaining a level playing field among all potential proposers, questions should be submitted in writing to the BAA mailbox (DARPA-BAA-10-59@darpa.mil) and will be answered in further Q&As such as this.

*Q9: Is the META seedling study report mentioned at Industry Day in December available yet?*

A9: Yes. It has been posted to the FedBizOpps page for the META-II BAA and to the META program web page on the DARPA/TTO website.